REMARKS

The present Amendment amends claims 2-5 and cancels claim 6. Therefore, the present application has pending claims 2-5.

35 U.S.C. §101 Rejections

Claims 2-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. As previously indicated, claim 6 was canceled. Therefore, this rejection regarding claim 6 is rendered moot. This rejection regarding the remaining claims 2-5 is traversed for the following reasons. Applicants submit that claims 2-5, as now more clearly recited, are in compliance with the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §101.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

Claims 2-3 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,120,131 to Seppala et al. ("Seppala"). As previously indicated, claim 6 was canceled. Therefore, this rejection regarding claim 6 is rendered moot. Regarding the remaining claims 2-3, this rejection is traversed for the following reasons. Applicants submit that the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in claims 2-3 are not taught or suggested by Seppala whether taken individually or in combination with any of the other references of record. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Amendments were made to the claims to more clearly describe features of the present invention. Specifically, amendments were made to the claims to more clearly recite that the present invention is directed to a third information processing apparatus as recited, for example, in independent claims 2 and 3.

The present invention, as recited in claim 2, as similarly recited in claim 3, provides a third information processing apparatus. The third information processing

includes: an Internet Protocol (IP) address pool including rent-out IP addresses; a receiver that receives an original IP address of a second information processing apparatus; a storage that stores correspondence information having a correspondence relationship between the original IP address of the second information processing apparatus and a rent-out IP address; and a transmitter that transmits the rent-out IP address to a first information processing apparatus.

According to the present invention, the first information processing apparatus sends communication packets to the second information processing apparatus, the communication packets including the rent-out IP address as a source address, and the IP address of the second information processing apparatus as a destination address. The prior art does not disclose all of these features.

The above described features of the present invention, as now more clearly recited in the claims, are not taught or suggested by any of the references of record, particularly Seppala, whether taken individually or in combination with any of the other references of record.

Seppala teaches selection of serving network element in a telecommunications network. However, there is no teaching or suggestion in Seppala of the third information processing apparatus as recited in claims 2 and 3 of the present invention.

Seppala discloses a method of selecting the serving network element in a telecommunications network. Mobility agents or routers transmit attribute information on one or more network elements in advertising messages to at least one mobile node. This information is used in the mobile node for selecting the serving network element.

One feature of the present invention, as recited in claim 2, and as similarly recited in claim 3, includes a third information processing, which includes: an Internet

Protocol (IP) address pool including rent-out IP addresses; a receiver that receives an original IP address of a second information processing apparatus; a storage that stores correspondence information having a correspondence relationship between the original IP address of the second information processing apparatus and a rent-out IP address; and a transmitter that transmits the rent-out IP address to a first information processing apparatus. Seppala does not disclose this feature.

In the present invention, a first information processing apparatus requests a rent-out address by sending an address of a second information processing apparatus, which is the communication destination of the first information processing apparatus, to a third information processing apparatus. The first information processing apparatus executes communication using the rent-out address. In addition, the third information processing apparatus stores and address of a second information processing apparatus, which is the communication destination of the first information processing apparatus, received from the first information processing apparatus in correspondence with the rent-out address. By use of the above-described features, which are not taught or suggested by Seppala, the present invention achieves a great effect in that the third information processing apparatus responds only to a question from the correspondent information apparatus and improves the reliability of communication via the network.

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Seppala discloses where correspondence information has an IP address of a second information processing apparatus, citing column 6, lines 12-23 (COA list). However, Seppala does not disclose receiving and storing an address of the second information processing apparatus, which is the communication destination, as in the present invention. The Examiner suggests that the COA of Seppala corresponds to the rent-out address of the present invention, the home address of a Mobile Node

corresponds to an original IP address of the first information processing apparatus, and the HA corresponds to the third information processing apparatus. However, the COA list only includes COA of FA and home address of a Mobile Node (*see, e.g.,* column 6, lines 16-17). The COA list does not include an address of the second information processing apparatus, which is the communication destination (*see, e.g.,* Fig. 1, item CH in Seppala).

Another feature of the present invention, as recited in claim 2, and as similarly recited in claim 3, includes where the first information processing apparatus sends communication packets to the second information processing apparatus, the communication packets including the rent-out IP address as a source address, and the IP address of the second information processing apparatus as a destination address. Seppala does not disclose this feature.

More specifically, Seppala does not teach or suggest where the first information processing apparatus sends communication packets to the second information processing apparatus, where the communication packets include said rent-out IP address as a source address, and where the IP address of the second information processing apparatus is a destination address. Accordingly, the present invention is quite different from Seppala.

Therefore, Seppala fails to teach or suggest "A third information processing apparatus comprising: an Internet Protocol (IP) address pool including rent-out IP addresses; a receiver that receives an original IP address of a second information processing apparatus; a storage that stores correspondence information having a correspondence relationship between said original IP address of said second information processing apparatus and a rent-out IP address; and a transmitter that transmits said rent-out IP address to a first information processing apparatus" as recited in claim 2, and as similarly recited in claim 3.

Furthermore, Seppala fails to teach or suggest "<u>wherein said first information</u> <u>processing apparatus sends communication packets to said second information</u> <u>processing apparatus, said communication packets including said rent-out IP</u> <u>address as a source address, and said IP address of said second information</u> <u>processing apparatus as a destination address</u>" as recited in claim 2, and as similarly recited in claim 3.

Therefore, Seppala does not teach or suggest the features of the present invention, as recited in claims 2 and 3. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection of claims 2 and 3 as being anticipated by Seppala are respectfully requested.

The remaining references of record have been studied. Applicants submit that they do not supply any of the deficiencies noted above with respect to the references used in the rejection of claims 2 and 3.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claims 4 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Seppala in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,317,798 to Saito ("Saito"). This rejection is traversed for the following reasons. Claims 4 and 5 are dependent on claim 3. Therefore, claims 4 and 5 are allowable for at least the same reasons previously discussed regarding independent claim 3.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 2-5 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of claims 2-5 is respectfully requested.

9

To the extent necessary, the applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of BRUNDIDGE & STANGER, P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-4888 (referencing Attorney Docket No. 500.42924X00).

Respectfully submitted,

BRUNDIDGE & STANGER, P.C.

/DONNA K. MASON/
Donna K. Mason
Registration No. 45,962

DKM/kah
(703) 684-1470